

## Church News.

### PEN WAVELETS.

Jesus Christ the Immanuel God with man, was perfect God in his Divine nature, therefore had knowledge of all languages. God the Father having created man and knowing what was in man, and what was needful for man's salvation, did through the *anointed Savior* give the perfect plan of salvation in such language that finite beings might comprehend and so fully understand as set forth in the Gospel that all our hopes for eternity and eternal felicity might rest upon the same without the least doubt on the part of humanity, providing the same is accepted and obeyed with a full purpose of heart, relying wholly upon Christ and the blood of the atonement. The foregoing being a conceded fact, it follows that Jesus Christ did not make use of ambiguous language in delivering the Gospel of salvation. Ambiguous means to wander about with irresolute mind; to be doubtful or uncertain, particularly in respect to signification; equivocal.—*Webster*.

There are writers who do make use of ambiguous language and who so state in their positions that they take their productions show the fact very largely. I will here state another fact of which I am not fearful of successful contradiction, and that is that the Redeemer of mankind did not make use of inexplicable language (or terms) in giving the plan of salvation. (I here define according to Webster.) Inexplicable. Not explainable; incapable of being explained, interpreted, or accounted for; incapable of being rendered plain and intelligible; as an *inexplicable* mystery, hence an unexplainable mystery. Could I believe that the Gospel of Christ in reference to man's salvation was such, I would cease to preach and despair of heaven. In the economy of salvation God gave two covenants (or Testaments) to man. In each he required ritual service, but a second or last will (or Testament) always disannuls or abrogates the former, hence, the first is void and fully annulled so far as it relates to ritual service. The law and the prophets, were, until John, then the kingdom of heaven or Gospel kingdom was preached. *Christ* became the end of the law to all that believed. (I suppose to all that believe in the Gospel.) All Christian people must believe the Gospel.

The Passover, the institution of which is recorded in Exodus 12, became a ritual service among the Jews under the first Testament, (Covenant) and was perpetuated by the Jews annually (unless by special arrangement.) The lamb having

been a type of *Christ* the *Lamb of God* who took away the sin of the world. *Christ* the antitype, having been sacrificed at the legal time for killing the lambs for the Passover, could not eat the Passover, though he desired to eat it, and no doubt would, had he not been necessitated to say, "It is finished and bow his head and give up the Ghost." The terms Passover and Supper are not "generic" but "specific," wherever found in the first or second Testament (Covenant) relating to ritual service or ordinances. I mean by "generic" various meanings, and by "specific" one special primary and original meaning. There is a law of language that a word applied to one thing can have but one meaning. Hence the term *Pascha* in the Greek has never been translated supper into the English, by any scholar in any part of the Holy Bible, and my prediction is, never will. Neither has any scholar ventured his or her reputation to translate the Greek term *Deipnon* or its correlative Passover, and to say that Luke, the inspired penman, would call the same ritual service or ordinance by the name; of Passover *Pasha* and Supper *Deipesai* is assuming a position that I could not defend, but attaching a specific meaning to each of the terms as we evidently must in order that we do no injustice to language and present the Gospel of Christ intelligently to intelligent people. The question of the Passover and Lord's supper must be defended in the same way that we defend the subject of baptism, the derivative *Baptizo*, must determine the mode, the commission, the form. The term *Baptizo* is a specific term and hence cannot mean to dip, pour and sprinkle in like manner. *Pascha* is a specific term and cannot mean Passover and supper when applied to Christian or ritual service *Deipnon* and its correlatives when applied to a Christian rite or ordinance cannot mean supper (Lord's) supper and Passover. A certain writer tries to blend the two together and calls it a dual-meal, then tells us that it is inexplicable that is, unexplainable, hence, he will never try to explain. I am glad he has put himself into that position, therefore there will be no controversy on the subject in the future. By a little careful discrimination I discover that dual, is from the Greek term *Duo*, signifying two; not parts of two things, but two definitely *unis* one, *duo* two, *tra* three etc. Now I ask in all candor, can it be shown by any person or persons that Jesus Christ on the night of his betrayal had a roasted lamb as the Passover victim, and also a supper which evidently means a full meal, and all readers of the Jewish history know that the evening meal or supper, was the fullest and most complete meal among them.

I predict that all such effort will prove futile.

Another thought. The Passover is nowhere in holy writ, called a meal. By saying *dual* meal, *dual* meaning two, we should be required to say Christ ate two meals on that memorable night. Surely such a thing would be inexplicable. We read that he arose from supper, not suppers, not plural but in the singular, one supper that evening. Now brethren let us call that by its proper name, supper, and Lord's supper, and continue to keep the ordinances as delivered unto us by the great head of the church, who of a truth gave us his Father's will in unambiguous language, susceptible of being explained, understood and obeyed by our common humanity. May the word of Divine truth ever be as a lamp to our feet, and a light to our pathway to lead us heavenward, and may the Holy Spirit be our comforter and guide, guiding us to the "Gospel of Christ, which is the power of God unto salvation," until life's pilgrimage on earth shall end, and then in the *church triumphant* we shall all join in participating in the marriage supper of the "*Lamb*."

J. B. WAMPLER.

Blanco, Pa.

### FROM EDMOND, KAN.

We wish to state that the aid which was solicited by our pastor, brother G. H. Friend at Falls City and vicinity was received by me at Norton on Jan. 29, 1895 in good condition. Owing to the storm that was then raging Brother Friend did not get the car full so he made room for four wagon loads which had been solicited by Fred Heikes for his school district and it was received by him (Heikes) at Norton. There were also some things sent to different ones at the Maple Grove church and vicinity which they received and the church holds their receipts. The rest of the things were then removed to my place and distributed among the brethren and to those out side who were in needy circumstances. There was \$25.00 sent by the Milledgeville church and after the expenses were paid there was \$3.93 to be divided among the needy. The things arrived just in time as most of the members had almost exhausted every way in which to obtain food, not to say any thing about clothing for that we did without.

We desire to tender our sincere thanks to the brethren for their liberality during this our time of need, and shall always remember their kindness with grateful hearts and thank God for his protecting care and help in time of trouble.

Feb. 10. H. FOSS, Receiver.

God will honor those who honor him.